

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 102

CG 020 035

AUTHOR Carlucci, John P.
TITLE Increasing Elementary School Parent(s) Implementation of Academic and or Social Recommendations from Psychological Evaluations by Utilizing a Three Stage Telephone Follow Up Process.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 63p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Behavior Problems; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Interpersonal Competence; *Learning Problems; *Parent Participation; Parent Role; Parent School Relationship; Psychological Evaluation; *School Psychologists; *Skill Development; Student Needs; Student Problems

ABSTRACT

This document describes a practicum designed to increase elementary school parents' implementation of academic and/or social skills recommendations from a school psychologist who performed psychoeducational evaluations. It notes that, when students were referred to the school psychologist, the psychologist would perform an evaluation, interpret results to parents, and make recommendations. Documentation is presented showing that many parents did not implement the recommendations. A strategy chosen to increase parent compliance is described in which the school psychologist convened a post-evaluation conference; made three telephone follow-up contacts at 6, 8, and 10 weeks after the original conference; and mailed a parent opinion questionnaire to parents 12 weeks after the original conference. An evaluation of this follow-up procedure is presented which found that: (1) 80% of the parents implemented 76% of the academic recommendations; (3) all parents implemented 50% of the social skills recommendations; and (4) all parents responded positively to 93% of the items on the parent questionnaire. The Parent Opinion Questionnaire and other relevant materials are appended. (Author/NB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED284102

P R A C T I C U M

REPORT

Center for the
Advancement of Education
Ed.D. Program

Increasing Elementary School Parent(s)
Implementation of Academic and or Social
Recommendations From Psychological Evalua-
tions by Utilizing a Three Stage Telephone
Follow Up Process

By

John P. Carlucci

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314
305/475-7300

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John P. Carlucci

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

N O V A U N I V E R S I T Y

CG 020035

Increasing Elementary School Parent(s) Implementation of
Academic and or Social Recommendations From Psychological
Evaluations by Utilizing a Three Stage Telephone Follow
Up Process

by

John P. Carlucci

Cluster XXI

A Practicum I Report Presented to the Ed.D. Program
in Early and Middle Childhood
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1987

Abstract

Increasing Elementary School Parent(s) Implementation of Academic and or Social Recommendations From Psychological Evaluations by Utilizing a Three Stage Telephone Follow Up Process. Carlucci, John P., 1987: Practicum Report, NOVA University, Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood. Descriptors: Elementary Education/ Parent Role/ Parent Implementation/ Academic / Social Recommendations/ Psychological Evaluation/ Parent School Psychologist Relationship/ Parent School Relationship/ Non Public Schools/ Private Schools/ Parochial School.

The goal of the practicum was to increase elementary school parent(s) implementation of academic and or social recommendations from the psychoeducational evaluation. The students were referred to the school psychologist for evaluation, the results and recommendations were interpreted to the parent(s) and many parent(s) did not implement the recommendations. This resulted in no behavioral change in the child.

The implementation strategy chosen was the school psychologist convened a post evaluation conference. Three telephone follow up contacts occurred 6, 8 and 10 weeks after the original conference. A parent opinion questionnaire was sent in the mail to the parents 12 weeks after the original conference.

The overall results were positive. Eighty percent of the parents implemented 73% of all recommendations. Eighty percent of the parents implemented 76% of the academic recommendations. All parents implemented 50% of the social recommendations. All parents responded positively to 93% of the items on the parent questionnaire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	ii
1. Academic Recommendations by School Psychologist and Implemented by Parents	
2. Social Skill Recommendations by School Psychologist and Implemented by Parents	
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Description of Community, including Socio-Economic and Geographic Factors	
B. Writer's Role and Responsibilities	
11. STUDY OF THE PROBLEM.....	4
A. Description of the Problem Situation	
B. Documentation of the Problem	
C. Analysis of the Causes	
D. Relationship of the Problem to the Literature	

	Page
III. Anticipated Outcomes and Evaluation	
Instruements.....	18
A. Goals and Objectives	
B. Measurement of Objectives	
C. Description of Plans For Analyzing	
Results	
IV. SOLUTION STRATEGY.....	21
A. Discussion and Evaluation of Possible	
Solution	
B. Description and Justification for	
Solution Selected	
C. Calendar Plan	
V. RESULTS.....	28
A. Discussion	
B. Recommendations	
Dissemination	
REFERENCES.....	34

APPENDICES

- A. PARENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE
- B. COVER LETTER
- C. VISUAL LEARNERS
- D. GENERAL INFORMATION
- E. VISUAL PERCEPTION
- F. NORTHSIDE COUNSELING AGENCIES
- G. SOUTHSIDE COUNSELING AGENCIES
- H. SOCIAL REINFORCERS
- I. SIMILARITIES

Chapter 1

The community utilized in this practicum is located in a major Mid West city in the Great Lakes region. The population of the city as of 1984 was 564,100 (Columbus Public Schools, 1984). The caucasian population according to the United States Bureau of Census, (1985), in the 1980 census was 69%. The total square mileage of the city as of 12/84 was 185.9 square miles (Columbus Public Schools, 1984). This is a white collar, service oriented, processing information city, lacking a heavy concentration of blue collar industrial workers. Busing has been utilized in the public schools for the purpose of desegregation since the fall of 1979.

The schools in the community used in this practicum are four urban non public elementary schools. Two schools

include kindergarten to eight grade and two are first to eighth grade inclusive. The total population of the four schools are approximately 1400 students. Children in the schools referred to the school psychologist for possible evaluation are in grades kindergarten to eight inclusive. They have been referred for either academic and or social difficulties. The referrals are initiated by legal guardians, parents, mental health centers, principal, teachers and students themselves.

The socioeconomic/racial structures of the schools are minimally integrated. The schools are minimally integrated because as non public facilities, they do not have to comply with federal and state desegregation mandates. The general composition of the parents and or legal guardians of the children in the schools are: 1. Caucasian, middle class, professional white collar families. 2. Caucasian, lower middle class, service and professional white collar families. 3. Caucasian, lower middle class, service oriented blue collar families. 4. Black, lower middle class, service oriented blue collar families.

The school psychologist conducting this practicum is a state certificated school psychologist and a state licensed professional counselor with a master of science degree in counselor education, working for a major

metropolitan Mid West public school system. The assignment since August, 1980, is to four non public elementary schools. The basic responsibility of this position is to administer and interpret psychological evaluations of referred school age children. The evaluations include intellectual, educational and or personality assessments utilizing various psychometric instruments. Associated with this role is the educational and mental health consultation and or counseling of referred school age children and their parents.

As an employee of a public city school system assigned to the non public school services in the department of federal and state programs, the work site for a psychologist according to the Columbus Public Schools, (1984), is not in the non public school building or property. Except for diagnosing, which is permissible in the building, the work site is a 25 foot mobile classroom, stationed on public property as close as possible to the non public building. Principals, parents, legal guardians, teachers and students have conferences with the school psychologist in the mobile unit.

Chapter 2

Problem

Children are referred to the school psychologist for possible evaluation. They are in grades kindergarten to eight inclusive. The students have been referred for academic and or social skills difficulties. The referrals are initiated by a parent(s), legal guardians, principal, teachers, mental health centers or the students themselves.

Upon receipt of a referral, the school psychologist consults with the initiator. Information concerning the specifics of the problem, duration of the difficulty, strategies already utilized by the teacher, and outcomes of the strategies are obtained. A decision is then made with this input whether to evaluate the child.

If evaluation is the chosen route of helping the child the school psychologist personally notifies the parent(s) by phone. The situation at school is explained and input is obtained from the parent(s). An appointment is arranged at a mutually agreed upon time at the school, during the school day, between the school psychologist and parent(s). The conference is approximately one hour. At

this time a developmental and family history is obtained. The problem at school is updated and reviewed. The school psychologist now begins the psychoeducational evaluation of the child.

The student is observed in the classroom for approximately 15 minutes. The student is removed from class and the school psychologist begins the psychometric section of the evaluation. The evaluation is completed, interpreted and written. The school psychologist notifies the parent(s) by mail that the evaluation is completed and an appointment is arranged to review the report. Present at this meeting is the school psychologist, principal and parent(s).

The evaluation report with recommendations and possible handouts with remediation strategies are presented. The minimum time allowed for this meeting is one hour. A copy of the evaluation is presented to the parent(s) and the school .

Difficulties being encountered after this meeting is the child's problems which originally initiated the evaluation remain unchanged. Minimal if any observable change has occurred. Possible reasons why the problem(s) have not been solved could be: 1. the family denies the problem. If the family feels no problem exists no improvement in the child's behavior is warranted. 2. A

poor family/school relationship exists. The family may feel this is the school's attempt to cause friction within the family. Therefore the family unites against the school by not implementing change in the child. 3. The family may not have understood the test results, recommendations and or remediation strategies. Not understanding the problem or knowing how to implement the recommendations the family does not pursue a positive route of change.

Concisely the problem is that a psychoeducational evaluation is conducted by the school psychologist and the results and recommendations are interpreted to the parent(s). A large number of parent(s) do not implement the academic and or social recommendations from the evaluation, resulting in no behavioral change in the child.

Documentation

Documentation of this problem is evidenced in two ways. First, by researching and comparing the end of the year grades and behavioral anecdotes on the school records of the students evaluated in the 1985 - 1986 school year with the recommendations made on the psychological evaluation. Secondly, by researching and comparing the academic updates conducted by the school counselor and

school psychologist in the Spring of 1986 with the academic results of the psychological evaluation. A summary of the total academic and social skill recommendations made by the school psychologist and the recommendations implemented by the parents will be shown in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1

Academic Recommendations by School Psychologist and
Implemented by Parent(s)

School	Recommendations
1. School Psychologist	18
Parent(s)	11
2. School Psychologist	14
Parent(s)	2
3. School Psychologist	31
Parent(s)	8
4. School Psychologist	52
Parent(s)	14

As shown in Table 1 school one had a total of 18 academic recommendations, parent(s) implemented 11 of 18. School 2 had a total of 14, parent(s) implemented 2 of 14. School 3 had a total of 31, parent(s) implemented 8 of 31. School 4 had a total of 52, parent(s) implemented 15 of 52.

Table 2

Social Skill Recommendations by School Psychologist and
Implemented by Parent(s)

School	Recommendations

1. School Psychologist	6
Parent(s)	3
2. School Psychologist	6
Parent(s)	1
3. School Psychologist	6
Parent(s)	0
4. School Psychologist	15
Parent(s)	5

As shown in Table 2 school one had a total of six social skill recommendations, parents implemented 3 of 6. School 2 had a total of six, parent(s) implemented 1 of 6. School 3 had a total of six, parent(s) implemented zero of 6. School 4 had a total of 15, parent(s) implemented 5 of 15.

Probable Causes

Probable causes of this problem in this author's work setting will be presented in four different aspects: 1. general problems parent(s) have themselves. 2. The perceptions the parent(s) have of the child. 3. The poor relationship existing between the home and school. 4. The interpretation of the report by the school psychologist to the parent(s).

In relation to the first aspect of this problem, according to Lapidès, (1977), parents experience symptoms of stress, high levels of anxiety, feelings of apprehensiveness with a desire to escape from the conference with the psychologist and a desire to escape from making difficult choices. Therefore, the parent(s) do not process all the information presented and decides to look for a new supply of information, new alternatives, second and third opinions. This results in procrastination by the parents and ultimately the child receives no help at all.

Parent(s) are naturally anxious when they meet professionals to discuss the problems their child is experiencing in school. When people are anxious they tend to find it more difficult to assimilate information. Therefore, they become unaware of how they are misunderstanding what is being said to them, and the child

receives the wrong help or no help ("Please Test Our Son", 1983).

Parent(s) perceptions of their child is the second probable cause for not implementing the recommendations. They feel the psychological tests induce anxiety for their child which affects performance and results. The parent(s) feel the child is not adequately or appropriately prepared to take the tests (Anderson, 1981). Therefore, the parent(s) lessen the validity of the results and the degree or existence of the problem. Resulting in no implementation of the recommendations.

Many parent(s) believe too much reliance may be placed on test results to the extent of ignoring other variables. Thirty-six percent of all parents feel that some tests are culturally biased, are unfair to students from poor backgrounds (Hardy, 1980). Therefore, they feel their children have not received a fair evaluation, resulting in not implementing the recommendations.

The third factor is the poor relationship between the home and school. According to Kelly, Beals, Dettre, VanVactor, Wagonseller, and Simpson, (1980), schools believe parents are not involved in their children's education, and parents have different goals than the schools. Parents feel the school in general misinforms them about their child. The school threatens their parenting

skills by pressuring them for a psychological evaluation of their child. In general the home and school tend not to cooperate, understand and trust each other. Therefore, they work at cross purposes with biased negative feelings toward each other. The result is the child being directed in two opposite directions, receiving no help and an increased negative attitude for each other.

The fourth probable cause is the interpretation and communication of the report by the school psychologist to the parent(s). According to NEA, (1978), and Kelly et al., (1980), the school psychologist both notifies the parent(s) and writes the report in complex professional terms, not in terminology the parent(s) can easily understand. Therefore, the parent(s) do not understand at all what is being conveyed, or finds the information too ambiguous and confusing. In this situation the parent(s) do not follow through with the recommendations.

Literature

The literature reviewed has shown different perspectives of this problem. Examples of such perspectives are the school psychologist's ability to understand the parent(s) and develop skills in working with families; and the values and skills of the parent(s) in dealing with both the school and their children's relation to the student's school related problems.

Literature supports the need of the school psychologist to work with families. Green and Fine, (1980), presented a rational and methodology for family involvement by school personnel. They stressed the need for school psychology training programs to respond programmatically to the training of their students in understanding and working with families. They presented a family systems approach in the form of questions concerning important family dynamics.

Framo, (1979), and Fine and Holt, (1983), discussed viewing children's behavior from a systems perspective which allows the school based consultant an expanded perception of the contextual function of the behavior. A child's life consists of two systems, home and school, often overlapping, and what occurs in one system can affect the child's behavior in the other system. By considering the relationships of the child to both home and school, a

more holistic view of the child is obtained and greater opportunity for family involvement is provided. The author's presented the school based consultant intervening from a systems perspective, using interviews, short term family counseling and teacher consultation.

Bowman and Goldberg, (1983), discussed the conceptualization of a child's problem integrating a family systems perspective with the individual assessment data enables the school psychologist to make an effective intervention in a single session meeting with the family following the evaluation. Applying the technique, reframing, gives the school psychologist a tool for increased commitment by the parents toward resolving the child's problem jointly. The family is presented the child's problems in interactional terms, with no one to blame. The underlying motivation is offered in a positive light. The family receives a new positive oriented definition of the problem.

According to Hopper, (1977), NEA, (1978), and Kelly et al., (1980), the school psychologist has difficulties understanding the skill levels of the parent(s) in their interpretation and communication of the evaluation to the parent(s). The school psychologist both notifies the parent and writes the report in complex professional terms, not in terminology the parents can easily identify

and understand. Therefore, the parent does not understand at all what is being conveyed, or finds the information too ambiguous and confusing.

The other side of the problem, according to Chilman, (1976), and Glynn, (1980), is when the school psychologist presents information from the report in too general of terms. Such as a low score in math is explained by your child needs more help in math homework assignments. This generality is as ambiguous and confusing as complex terminology. Specifics in easily understandable language is required.

According to Hardy, (1980), Anderson, (1981), and Turnbull and Leonard, (1981), school psychologists should establish a working relationship with parent(s). Parent(s) control most of the educational opportunities of the child. Working with parent(s) is a means of contributing to the well being of the child, a better education for the child. The school psychologist should be sensitive to the needs of the parent(s), their family. Areas to be sensitive to would be adequate notification of conference, lack of transportation, lack of baby-sitting and or a lack of desire to share in decision making, to assume responsibility.

Literature reviewed demonstrating parent(s) differing skills and values in dealing with both their child and

school in relation to the students school related problems will now be presented. A difficulty some parent(s) possess in dealing with the personnel of their child's schools deals with their own educational levels (Rhodes & Sweeney 1977; Glynn, 1980). They lack specific skills needed to help their children. They generally do not know how to obtain accurate and specific information about the child, from the school. The parent(s) do not understand the educational setting where the problem exists. Furthermore, the parent(s) are not familiar with the psychometric instruments used to test their child and they do not know of educational resources available in their community. The result is parent(s) do not implement the recommendations of the evaluation, since they do not understand the curriculum, classroom setting(s), tests utilized and community resources.

According to Gerber, (1976), and Kelly et al., (1980), some parents disagree about the general value of achieving in school. The child may be following a pattern established by one or both parents. The parent who experienced difficulty in school tends to convey this to the child as acceptable behavior. The parent therefore minimizes the difficulties. This places the child in conflict. Should the student model the parent(s) and not achieve to potential or the school and become all he/she

can become?

Kelly et al., (1980), comment that some parents confuse the terms between school psychologist, psychological evaluation and psychiatrist, psychiatric evaluation. The latter terms to them imply crazy. Therefore, they fear the results of the evaluation may place blame on them for having caused the child's problems. Possessing such fear this parent views the entire evaluation as a negative implication of their own capabilities. They feel by singling their child out the school is emphasizing to them and others the child is different. The parent(s) interpret this as a direct reflection on themselves as parents and deny the existence of the child's problem(s).

According to Harris and Fong, (1985), parent(s) are never fully prepared for a child with mild or severe learning difficulties. They grieve and intellectually struggle with the idea that their child may not become more self-sufficient with age, requiring more of their time, energy and resources over the years. Parent(s) may learn remediation techniques to help the child, but some parent(s) are not able to overcome the real or imaginary sorrow of their child's problems resulting in an inability to implement the strategies (Harris, 1983).

Chapter 3

Goals

The following goals of this practicum were to have the parent(s) of referred students possess the needed skills to implement the recommendations of the school psychologist and have the parent(s) implement the academic and social skill recommendations from the psychological evaluation.

Objectives

The objectives of this practicum were four. First, 75% of the parents of the referred children implement 70% of the overall recommendations from the psychological evaluation. Second, 75% of parents implement at least 75% of academic recommendations. Third, all parents implement at least 75% of social recommendations. Fourth, all parents respond positively to 80% of the items on the parent opinion questionnaire.

Instrument

The instrument to measure the objectives was a written parent opinion questionnaire. The questionnaire had a total of 10 questions, with instructions to the parent(s) to check the answer which best described their feelings. All questions were responded with a yes or no. Two questions had two sections for completion. The second section for these questions was a fill in the blank with the number of recommendations implemented. The 10 questions were divided into two major sections, questions which dealt with the behavior of the school psychologist and the parent(s) behavior. A space was provided on the bottom of the questionnaire for the parent(s) to add comments which they felt were not addressed by the questionnaire. (see appendix A). A personal cover letter explained and stressed the importance of returning the questionnaire, asking the parent(s) to return this within a specified time. (see appendix B). This letter attached to the questionnaire was mailed directly to the parent(s) with a stamped return envelope enclosed (Manlove, 1976; Fairchild, 1985).

Analyze

The data was analyzed in terms of percentages. The objectives were considered achieved when the final percentages equaled or exceeded the specified percentages in the four objectives. The data is presented in narrative form.

Chapter 4

Possible Solutions

The literature reviewed has shown different approaches the school psychologist can utilize to improve parental involvement of their referred child. Examples of such approaches are: Parent(s) and child participating in short term therapy with the school psychologist; different perspectives in dealing with a referred child's family in therapy; and how the school psychologist can integrate the child's problem with assessment data into a single session with the family.

According to Bowman et al., (1983), the school psychologist can increase parent participation by reframing the child's problem. The school psychologist presents the child's problem in interactional terms with no one to blame. An example of such reframing is: Mark was referred for an evaluation for repeated fights in school, lying, defiant attitude towards teachers and aggression at home. After an evaluation and family history interview the school psychologist planned on recommending family

counseling to the parent(s). In the conference the school psychologist reframed Mark's negative behaviorism in a positive light by focusing upon his underlying motivation; that is, to help his family by uniting them in their concern for him, he had taken responsibility for the family. After presenting the problem from a positive family perspective counseling was suggested and the family accepted it as a logical outgrowth of the conference.

Green et al., (1980), suggest the school psychologist facilitate short term therapy with the family of the referred student. The goal of therapy is to help the child with school based problems. The school psychologist presents the problem as the child, family and school perceive it. Nurturing instead of blaming statements are communicated. Then the school psychologist can help the parents in developing effective parenting skills. As direct and honest communication with the parents clarify issues concerning learning, academic expectations and self worth, the family helps the child function more effectively in school.

According to Fine et al., (1983), the school psychologist using short term therapy with a family to implement recommendations view the child in a family systems approach. The child's life is an integration overlapping home and school. An example is a child is

seen in school as an aggressive bully, quick to anger and physical disagreement. A family history revealed that the father both condones and uses physical behavior.

Therefore, the school psychologist views the child as modeling valued home behavior patterns in school. The school psychologist working with this perspective aligns the family as collaborators with the school in teaching and reinforcing more socially appropriate behaviors, without attacking family values.

Bowman, et al., (1983), utilizing the concept of reframing significantly improved parent cooperation in implementing recommendations. Literature reviewed such as Green et al., (1980), Fine et al., (1983), presented theories without conclusive results proving increased parental involvement.

Another possible solution strategy would be for the school psychologist to have a post evaluation conference with the parent(s). At this meeting the test results, recommendations and appropriate remediation strategies are presented and reviewed in detail. A follow up phone conference initiated by the school psychologist with the parent(s) would occur after the original meeting and a follow up questionnaire would be sent to the parent(s) after the phone conference. The school psychologist would be available for assistance at the parent(s) request.

Solution Selected

It is felt the solutions presented by Bowman et al., (1983), would not work with this population. Students seen by the school psychologist in the schools have significant academic difficulties resulting in some acting out behaviors. The majority of the recommendations are academically oriented and the school psychologist wants the parent(s) to implement at least 70% of all the recommendations, not focus on one, counseling, to the extent of ignoring the others.

Solutions presented by Green et al., (1980). and Fine et al., (1983), suggest short term family therapy. Short term therapy is a good concept but not practical with this population. The population consists of both parents working or single parents working a distance from the schools. The school psychologist's workday is the same as the parent(s). Therefore, weekly short term therapy would occur in the evening or school day. This would require losing time from work and or child care in the evening, for the parent(s), straining the financial resources of the family.

It is felt the most appropriate solution strategy for this population, work setting and goals was the school psychologist convening a post evaluation conference with

three follow up contacts with the parent(s) occurring 6, 8 and 12 weeks after the original conference. This solution was projected to work for various reasons: time spent at school by the parent(s) was minimal. They did not have to lose time from their employment. Time limits placed on parent(s) to initiate and implement strategies were fair and realistic, parent(s) had 3 months. The recommendations with remediation strategy handouts were presented and reviewed in detail. Therefore, the parent(s) had suggestions with procedures at their finger tips to implement. Finally the school psychologist was available for assistance during the entire 3 months.

Solution Steps

1. School psychologist arranged a post evaluation conference with the parent(s) of the referred student.

2. The school psychologist held an one hour post evaluation conference with the parent(s) reviewing in detail the results and recommendations of the report. Remediation strategy handouts if appropriate were presented and explained using detailed practical examples in easily understood language. This occurred approximately two weeks after the evaluation was conducted.
3. Six weeks after the post evaluation conference a follow up phone conference to the parent(s) by the school psychologist was initiated to offer further clarification and or assistance in the implementation of the recommendations.
4. Eight weeks after the post evaluation conference a second follow up phone conference to the parent(s) was initiated by the school psychologist to offer further clarification and or assistance in the implementation of the recommendations.
5. Ten weeks after the post evaluation conference a third follow up conference to the parent(s) was initiated by the school psychologist to offer further clarification and or assistance in the implementation of the recommendations.

6. Twelve weeks after the post evaluation conference the school psychologist mailed a parent opinion questionnaire to the parent(s) in a stamped self addressed envelope.
7. Within three weeks of parent(s) receiving questionnaire they returned it to the school psychologist.
8. The fifteenth week after the post evaluation conference, upon the school psychologist's receipt of the completed questionnaire the evaluation of the objectives was assessed.

Chapter 5

Results

Objective one, 75% of the parent(s) of the referred children implement 70% of the overall recommendations, was achieved. Eighty percent of the parents of the referred children implemented 73% of all recommendations made. Objective two, 75% of parents implement at least 75% of academic recommendations, was achieved. Eighty percent of the parents implemented 76% of the academic recommendations. (see appendices C, D and E). Objective three, all parents implement at least 75% of social recommendations, was not achieved. All parents implemented 50% of the social recommendations. (see appendices F, G and H). Objective four, all parents respond positively to 80% of the items on the parent opinion questionnaire, was met. All the parents responded positively to 93% of the items on the parent questionnaire.

Discussion

During the implementation period, this author logged noteworthy facts. The implementation period was extended from three to four months to obtain a minimum number of students, since the schools generated an extremely small testing caseload. This was the result of the schools emphasis on consultation instead of evaluation. During the post evaluation conferences, on two occasions, both parents attended. This is considered somewhat unusual since 80% of the referred students live in a two parent household. Even though the parent(s) were informed the examiner would contact them at 6, 8 and 10 week intervals by phone the parents always sounded surprised the contact occurred though always pleased by the follow up. Although the parents were encouraged to contact the examiner with questions none did. Time spent on phone follow up conferences ranged from 5 to 30 minutes. The average call was 11 minutes. One parent during the follow up call requested additional information be sent to aid them in the remediation of the child's abstract thinking abilities. (see appendix I). This author expected more requests. It appeared as though the post evaluation conference sufficiently explained remediation techniques.

Three parents made additional comments on the questionnaire. All the comments made were positive. Such

comments were:

"I'm not sure that I agree with your interpretations, even though I would like to. I do thank-you for your help and requesting my comments."

"In the six weeks since the post evaluation conference, my son's situation has improved greatly. Mr. Carlucci has been extremely concerned, professional and interested in my son's situation. My wife and I are thankful for all the help, thoughtfulness and follow-up expended in our son's interests."

"Mr. Carlucci has been very helpful in several ways. He helped me feel at ease during our post evaluation conference, a stressful time for parents. We have found excellent family counseling at one of the agencies he recommended. Our son seems to be doing better at school."

The social recommendations made were to local counseling agencies and types of social reinforcers to increase the quality of positive reinforcement. The parents never specified during the follow up conferences or on the questionnaire why the social recommendations are not implemented. Possible reasons this objective was not achieved are: 1. A mutual time within the family and between the agency was not available. 2. Counseling was

unaffordable. 3. Transportation was not available. 4. Parents feared counseling would present a flaw in their parenting skills. 5. Being afraid of the unknown, desiring to maintain the status quo within the family unit. 6. A desire to be helped immediately, therefore rejecting an agency's waiting list. 7. Parent's perceptions the child's problems did not warrant counseling. 8. No available outside emotional support to foster participation in counseling. 9. Parent's perceptions the child does not need social reinforcers but discipline.

Three of the four projected objectives were achieved.

The number of students used in this practicum was 10. No parent(s) attempted to contact the school psychologist during implementation. Objective three, implementation of social recommendations was not met. This could have occurred for many reasons, such as not possessing the emotional stamina, financial and or transportation resources to attend counseling.

Recommendations

1. A larger number of subjects could further support that the solution strategy increased the parents implementation of recommendations.
2. Increase time period of practicum to see if parent

implementation continues.

3. Replace phone call follow up conferences with group conferences to increase communication with parent(s).
4. Counseling would occur free at the local school. This would help insure parent participation.
5. The school psychologist would require both parents from two parent households to attend the post evaluation conference. This can decrease the possibility of incorrect information and interpretation of the results to the other parent, affecting the consistency and implementation of the recommendations.

Dissemination

1. Inservice meetings at each of the four, with entire staff.
2. Inservice presentation for the school psychologists in this author's district.
3. Inservice presentation at the Spring, 1987, conference of the state regional school psychological organization.

4. Submit for presentation at the annual Spring, 1988, conference of the National Association of School Psychologists.
5. Submit for presentation at the annual Summer, 1988, conference of the International Association of School Psychologists.
6. Submit for publication to the appropriate professional journals, such as Psychology in the Schools.
7. Submit for inclusion in the ERIC system.
8. Inservice the local Community College Behavioral Science and Mental Health departments where this writer is a part time instructor.

References

- Anderson, C. (1983). An ecological developmental model for a family orientation in school psychology. Journal of School Psychology, 21, 179-189.
- Anderson, S. (1981, January). Parents and standardized tests. Peabody Journal of Education, 96-107.
- Bowman, P. & Goldberg, M. (1983). Reframing: A tool for the school psychologist. Psychology in the Schools, 20, 210-214.
- Chilman, C. (1976). Handbook of behavior modification and behavior therapy. N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Columbus Public Schools. (1984). Non-Public school services (NPSS) policies and procedures handbook. Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools.
- Fairchild, T. (1985). Obtaining Consumer feedback as a means of evaluating school psychology intern performance. Psychology in the Schools, 22, 419-428.
- Fine, M. & Holt, P. (1983). Intervening with school problems: A family systems perspective. Psychology in the Schools, 20, 59-66.
- Framo, J. (1979). Family theory and therapy. American Psychologist, 34, 982-992.

- Gerber, G. (1976). Conflicts in values between parents of symptomatic and normal children. Psychological Reports, 38, 91-98.
- Green, K. & Fine, M. (1980). Family therapy: A case for training school psychologists. Psychology in the Schools, 17, 241-248.
- Hardy, R. (1980, May). Parent Attitudes toward testing. Memphis Area Conference on Testing and Public Concerns, Memphis, TN.
- Harris, S. (1983). Families of the developmentally disabled: A guide to behavioral intervention. Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon Press.
- Harris, S. & Fong, P. (1985). The family and the school. School Psychology Review, 4(2), 1-4.
- Hopper, G. (1977). Parental understanding of their child's test results as interpreted by elementary school teachers. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 10(2), 84-89.
- Kelly, E., Beals, M., Dettre, J., VanVactor, J., Wagonseller, B., & Simpson, J. (1980). Project S.P.E.C.T.R.E.: Special education curriculum and training for regular educators. Las Vegas, NV.: Nevada University.

- Lapides, J. (1977). The school psychologist as a facilitator of parent involvement in decisions concerning their children: An overview. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
- Manlove, D. (1976). Parent opinion inventory manual. Arlington, VA.: National Study of School Evaluation.
- National Education Association. (1978). A study Report. Education for all handicapped children: Consensus, conflict and challenge. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- (1983). Please test our son: The role of parents in the assessment process. The Exceptional Parent, 13, 49-54.
- Rhodes, W. & Sweeney, D. (1977). Alternatives to litigation: The necessity for parent consultation. Final Institute Report, Michigan Department of Education (pp. 50-111). Lansing, MI.
- Turnbull, A. & Leonard, J. (1981). Parent involvement in special education: Emerging advocacy roles. School Psychology Review, 10, 37-44.
- United States Bureau of the Census and Columbus Factpack. (1985). Sales and marketing management survey of buying power. Columbus, OH.: Columbus Regional Information Center.

APPENDIX A
PARENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

PARENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE CHECK YOUR ANSWER:

1. Did the school psychologist contact you to arrange
post evaluation conference? yes no
2. Was the evaluation discussed with you? yes no
3. Was the information presented in an organized,
understandable manner? yes no
4. Did the school psychologist present specific examples
to assist you in helping your child? yes no
5. Was the school psychologist available after the
conference to assist you in helping your child?
yes no
6. Did the school psychologist contact you 6 weeks after
the post evaluation conference by phone? yes no
7. Did the school psychologist contact you 8 weeks after
the post evaluation conference by phone? yes no
8. Did you implement academic recommendations?
yes no
- a. How many academic recommendations were implemented?

9. Did you implement social skill recommendations?

yes no

a. How many social skill recommendations were
implemented?

10. Have the recommendations helped your child?

yes no

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

APPENDIX B
COVER LETTER

Dear Parent(s);

The purpose of this questionnaire is to assist the school in learning more about the evaluation of your child. Your responses are important to this learning process. The answers you give will be completely confidential. Please check the response which best resembles how you feel and complete the blanks. Feel comfortable in adding comments on the bottom of the questionnaire which you feel were not addressed.

Thank-you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

John P. Carlucci, M.S.
School Psychologist

APPENDIX C
VISUAL LEARNERS

Visual learners learn best in the following ways:

1. Learn by seeing and watching demonstrations
(Learning style).
2. Like description, sometimes stops reading to stare
into space and imagine scene; possess intense
concentration (Reading).
3. Recognizes words by sight; relies on configuration
of words (Spelling).
4. Remembers faces, forgets names; writes things down,
takes notes (Memory).
5. Generally unaware of sounds; distracted by visual
disorder or movement (Distractibility).

APPENDIX D
GENERAL INFORMATION

General Information

This is acquired both at home and at school. Earlier learned concepts should be reinforced by frequent review of basics. Parents should stimulate the child to have a variety of reading experiences. A child with a deficiency in the information area will have to have alot of individual attention.

1. Plan visits to community resources, zoo, children's museum, etc..
2. Have a wide variety of primary books and pictures available.
3. Have the child discuss local geography, street address, names of street in neighborhood, etc..
4. Review basic concepts such as days of the week, months, coin values concepts of opposite and same, etc..
5. Provide high interest, low vocabulary reading materials.
6. Discuss names and locations of neighboring cities. teach directions, North, East, South and West.

APPENDIX E
VISUAL PERCEPTION

Activities

1. Many coloring exercises, developing the ability to color within boundaries.
2. Exercises involving cutting around various outline, such as coupons.
3. Exercises using dot to dots to make pictures.
4. Putting puzzles together.
5. Describing pictures in detail.
6. Finding missing parts in pictures.
7. Exercises using tracing techniques, especially three dimensional.
8. Practice in clay modeling.

APPENDIX F
NORTHSIDE COUNSELING AGENCIES

Family Counseling

1. Northwest Counseling Services

1560 Fishinger Road

457 - 7876

2. The Bridge Counseling Center

4897 Karl Road

846 - 2588

3. Dublin Counseling Center

5614 Post Road

889 - 5722

APPENDIX G
SOUTHSIDE COUNSELING AGENCIES

Family Counseling

1. Family Counseling and Crittentin Services

185 South 5th Street

221 - 7608

2. Diocesan Child Guidance Center

840 West State Street

221 - 7855

3. Wilson Family and Child Guidance Center

301 Obetz Road

497 - 0122

APPENDIX H
SOCIAL REINFORCERS

Social reinforcers include words of praise, expressions nearness and physical contact.

Possible Praising Words and Phrases

Good

Excellent

Exactly

Good thinking

You really pay attention

That was very kind of you

I'm pleased with that

Great

I love you

Expressions

Smiling

Nodding up and down

Laughing

Winking

Nearness

Walking together

Talking and listening to each other

Playing games with your child

Physical Contact

Touching Sitting in lap

Stroking arm

Holding hand

Hugging

APPENDIX I
SIMILARITIES

Similarities

This is abstract and concrete reasoning abilities. Understanding the concept of sameness and differences is essential. Emphasis should initially be placed on concrete rather than abstract, until the child's ability to understand abstractions develops and or improves.

1. Exercises aiding in showing various relationships.
Use dissimilar objects which have a commonality of shape, the roundness of a ball, apple, etc.. Use dissimilar objects which have sameness of color, green traffic light and green grass, etc..
2. Sentence completions: Rabbits are fast, turtles are ; Summer is hot, winter is .
3. Acting out emotions such as happy, angry, etc..
4. Teach generalizations, such as in types of clothing.
5. Discussion of key determiners in sentences, more/less, less/least, etc..
6. Tell what is absurd or foolish about a statement or story.
7. Tell how classmates are alike and different.